arXiv:1601.03470v1 [math.SG] 14 Jan 2016

Multiplicity and ellipticity of closed characteristics on compact star-shaped hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$

Huagui Duan[1],* Hui Liu[2†]

[1] School of Mathematical Sciences and LPMC, Nankai University,
Tianjin 300071, People's Republic of China
[2] Key Laboratory of Wu Wen-Tsun Mathematics, Chinese Academy of Sciences,
School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Science and Technology of China,
Hefei, Anhui 230026, People's Republic of China

December 21, 2015

Abstract

In this paper, we firstly generalize some theories developed by I. Ekeland and H. Hofer in [EkH] for closed characteristics on compact convex hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$ to star-shaped hypersurfaces. As applications we use Ekeland-Hofer theory and index iteration theory to prove that if a compact star-shaped hypersuface in $\mathbf{R}^4$ satisfying some suitable pinching condition carries exactly two geometrically distinct closed characteristics, then both of them must be elliptic. We also conclude that the theory developed by Y. Long and C. Zhu in [LoZ] still holds for dynamically convex star-shaped hypersurfaces, and combining it with the results in [WHL], [LLW], [Wan3], we obtain that there exist at least n closed characteristics on every dynamically convex star-shaped hypersurface in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$ for $n = 3, 4$.

Key words: Compact star-shaped hypersurfaces, closed characteristics, Hamiltonian systems, Ekeland-Hofer theory, index iteration theory.

AMS Subject Classification: 58E05, 37J45, 34C25.

1 Introduction and main result

Let Σ be a C^3 compact hypersurface in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$ strictly star-shaped with respect to the origin, i.e., the tangent hyperplane at any $x \in \Sigma$ does not intersect the origin. We denote the set of all such hypersurfaces by $\mathcal{H}_{st}(2n)$, and denote by $\mathcal{H}_{con}(2n)$ the subset of $\mathcal{H}_{st}(2n)$ which consists of all

*Partially supported by NSFC (Nos. 11131004, 11471169), LPMC of MOE of China and Nankai University. E-mail: duanhg@nankai.edu.cn.

†Partially supported by NSFC (Nos.11401555, 11371339), Anhui Provincial Natural Science Foundation (No. 1608085QA01). E-mail: huiliu@ustc.edu.cn.

strictly convex hypersurfaces. We consider closed characteristics (τ, y) on Σ, which are solutions of the following problem

$$\begin{cases} \dot{y} = JN_\Sigma(y), \\ y(\tau) = y(0), \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -I_n \\ I_n & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, I_n is the identity matrix in $\mathbf{R}^n$, $\tau > 0$, $N_\Sigma(y)$ is the outward normal vector of Σ at y normalized by the condition $N_\Sigma(y) \cdot y = 1$. Here $a \cdot b$ denotes the standard inner product of $a, b \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}$. A closed characteristic (τ, y) is *prime*, if τ is the minimal period of y. Two closed characteristics (τ, y) and (σ, z) are *geometrically distinct*, if $y(\mathbf{R}) \neq z(\mathbf{R})$. We denote by $\mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$ the set of geometrically distinct closed characteristics (τ, y) on $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{st}(2n)$. A closed characteristic (τ, y) is *non-degenerate* if 1 is a Floquet multiplier of y of precisely algebraic multiplicity 2; *hyperbolic* if 1 is a double Floquet multiplier of it and all the other Floquet multipliers are not on $\mathbf{U} = \{z \in \mathbf{C} \mid |z| = 1\}$, i.e., the unit circle in the complex plane; *elliptic* if all the Floquet multipliers of y are on $\mathbf{U}$. We call a $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}(2n)$ *non-degenerate* if all the closed characteristics on Σ together with all of their iterations are non-degenerate.

Fix a constant α satisfying $1 < \alpha < 2$ and define the Hamiltonian function $H_\alpha : \mathbf{R}^{2n} \to [0, +\infty)$ by

$$H_\alpha(x) = j(x)^\alpha, \qquad \forall x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}, \tag{1.2}$$

where j is the gauge function of Σ, i.e., $j(x) = \lambda$ if $x = \lambda y$ for some $\lambda > 0$ and $y \in \Sigma$ when $x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n} \setminus \{0\}$, and $j(0) = 0$. Then $H_\alpha \in C^1(\mathbf{R}^{2n}, \mathbf{R}) \cap C^3(\mathbf{R}^{2n} \setminus \{0\}, \mathbf{R})$ and $\Sigma = H_\alpha^{-1}(1)$. It is well-known that the problem (1.1) is equivalent to the following given energy problem of the Hamiltonian system

$$\begin{cases} \dot{y}(t) = JH'_\alpha(y(t)), \quad H_\alpha(y(t)) = 1, \qquad \forall t \in \mathbf{R}, \\ y(\tau) = y(0). \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

Denote by $\mathcal{T}(\Sigma, \alpha)$ the set of all geometrically distinct solutions (τ, y) of the problem (1.3). Note that elements in $\mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$ and $\mathcal{T}(\Sigma, \alpha)$ are one to one correspondent to each other.

The study on closed characteristics in the global sense started in 1978, when the existence of at least one closed characteristic was first established on any $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{st}(2n)$ by P. Rabinowitz in [Rab] and on any $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{con}(2n)$ by A. Weinstein in [Wei] independently, since then the existence of multiple closed characteristics on $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{con}(2n)$ has been deeply studied by many mathematicians, for example, studies in [EkL], [EkH], [Szu], [HWZ1], [LoZ], [WHL], [Wan2] and [Wan3] for convex hypersurfaces. For the star-shaped hypersurfaces, in [Gir] of 1984 and [BLMR] of 1985, $^{\#}\mathcal{T}(\Sigma) \geq n$ for $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{st}(2n)$ was proved under some pinching conditions. In [Vit1] of 1989, C. Viterbo proved a generic existence result for infinitely many closed characteristics on star-shaped hypersurfaces. In [HuL] of 2002, X. Hu and Y. Long proved that $^{\#}\mathcal{T}(\Sigma) \geq 2$ for $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{st}(2n)$ on which all the closed characteristics and their iterates are non-degenerate. In [HWZ2] of 2003, H. Hofer, K. Wysocki, and E. Zehnder proved any non-degenerate compact star-shaped hypersurface has either two or infinitely closed characteristics, provided that all stable and unstable manifolds of the hyperbolic closed characteristics intersect transversally. Recently $^{\#}\mathcal{T}(\Sigma) \geq 2$ was first proved

for every $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{st}(4)$ by D. Cristofaro-Gardiner and M. Hutchings in [CGH] without any pinching or non-degeneracy conditions. Different proofs of this result can also be found in [GHHM], [LLo1] and [GiG].

I. Ekeland and H. Hofer in [EkH] provided a close relationship between the set of Maslov-type indices of closed characteristics and the set of even positive integers, which is the core in studying the multiplicity and ellipticity of the closed characteristics on compact convex hypersurfaces (cf. [LoZ]). Our main goal in this paper is to generalize the theory of Ekeland-Hofer to compact star-shaped hypersurfaces and as its applications we give some multiplicity and stability results of closed characteristics on compact star-shaped hypersurfaces.

For the stability of closed characteristics on $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{st}(2n)$ we refer the readers to [LiL] and [LLo2]. Specially, in [LLo2], H. Liu and Y. Long proved that $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{st}(4)$ and $^{\#}\mathcal{T}(\Sigma) = 2$ imply that both of the closed characteristics must be elliptic provided that Σ is symmetric with respect to the origin.

Let $n(y)$ be the unit outward normal vector of Σ at y and $d(y) := n(y) \cdot y$, i.e., the distance between the origin of $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$ and the tangent hyperplane to Σ at y, then $d(y) > 0$ for all $y \in \Sigma$ since Σ is strictly star-shaped. Let $d = \min\{d(y) : y \in \Sigma\}$ and $R = \max\{|y| : y \in \Sigma\}$. In this paper, we prove, under suitable pinching condition, the symmetric condition in Theorem 1.4 of [LLo2] can be dropped, i.e., the following theorem holds.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{st}(4)$ satisfy $^{\#}\mathcal{T}(\Sigma) = 2$ and $R^2 < 2d^2$. Then both of the closed characteristics are elliptic.*

Remark 1.2. Note that the pinching condition on Σ in Theorem 1.1 is only used to get a contradiction in the study of the Subcase 1.2 of Case 1 in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

In Definition 1.2 of [HWZ1], An interesting class of contact forms on S^3 which are called dynamically convex contact forms was introduced. Similarly, we give the following definition:

Definition 1.3. *$\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{st}(2n)$ is called dynamically convex if any closed characteristic (τ, y) on Σ has its Maslov-type index not less than n.*

Note that from the proof of Theorem 3.4 of [HWZ1], for $n = 2$, the above definition coincides with that of [HWZ1]. Also from the Remark before Definition 3.6 of [HWZ1] and Corollary 1.2 of [LoZ], we know any $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{con}(2n)$ is dynamically convex. As mentioned before Definition 1.2 of [HWZ1], "strictly convex" is not a symplectically invariant concept, thus a dynamically convex $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{st}(2n)$ need not to be convex.

In this paper, we also prove the main results of [LoZ], [WHL], [Wan2], [Wan3] and [HuO] hold for dynamically convex star-shaped hypersurfaces which cover the works of these literatures. Specially, we have:

Theorem 1.4. *Let $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{st}(2n)$ be dynamically convex. Then $^{\#}\mathcal{T}(\Sigma) \geq [\frac{n+1}{2}] + 1$. If Σ is nondegenerate, then $^{\#}\mathcal{T}(\Sigma) \geq n$. If $^{\#}\mathcal{T}(\Sigma) < +\infty$, then there exists at least two elliptic closed characteristic on Σ, and at least $[n/2]$ closed characteristics possessing irrational mean indices.*

Theorem 1.5. *Let $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{st}(2n)$ be dynamically convex. Then $^{\#}\mathcal{T}(\Sigma) \geq n$ for $n = 3, 4$.*

Remark 1.6. Note that J. Gutt and J. Kang in [GuK] proved that if $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{st}(2n)$ is non-degenerate and dynamically convex, then there exist at least n closed characteristics on such Σ, whose iterates' Conley-Zehnder indices possess the same parity. Note that their index definition is slightly different from ours. Also recently, M. Abreu and L. Macarini in [AbM] gave a sharp lower bound for the number of geometrically distinct contractible periodic orbits of non-degenerate dynamically convex Reeb flows on prequantizations of symplectic manifolds that are not aspherical, which implies results of [GuK] (cf. Corollary 2.9 of [AbM]). We also mention that very recently, Y. Long, W. Wang and the authors in [DLLW] proved some sharp multiplicity results for non-degenerate star-shaped hypersurfaces under some index conditions, which are weaker than the convex or dynamically convex case. Our Theorem 1.4 and Theorem 1.5 give new multiplicity and stability results for the degenerate, dynamically convex, star-shaped hypersurfaces.

This paper is arranged as follows. In Sections 2 and 3, following the frame works of [Vit1], [LLW] and [Eke], we establish a variational structure for closed characteristics on star-shaped hypersurfaces and prove some theories in [EkH] hold for star-shaped case, we omit most of the details of the proofs of the theories below and only point out differences from [Vit1], [LLW] and [Eke] when necessary. In Section 3.2, we further study the critical values obtained in Section 3.1 when the star-shaped hypersurface is suitably pinched, which we will use to prove Theorem 1.1 in Section 4. In Section 4, we also explain how to get Theorems 1.4 and 1.5 as another application of Ekeland-Hofer theory. In Section 5 (an appendix), we briefly review the equivariant Morse theory and the resonance identities for closed characteristics on compact star-shaped hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$ developed in [LLW], which are used in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

In this paper, let $\mathbf{N}$, $\mathbf{N}_0$, $\mathbf{Z}$, $\mathbf{Q}$, $\mathbf{R}$, $\mathbf{C}$ and $\mathbf{R}^+$ denote the sets of natural integers, non-negative integers, integers, rational numbers, real numbers, complex numbers and positive real numbers respectively. We define the function $[a] = \max\{k \in \mathbf{Z} \mid k \le a\}$, $\{a\} = a - [a]$, and $E(a) = \min\{k \in \mathbf{Z} \mid k \ge a\}$. Denote by $a \cdot b$ and $|a|$ the standard inner product and norm in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$. Denote by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and $\| \cdot \|$ the standard L^2 inner product and L^2 norm. For an S^1-space X, we denote by X_{S^1} the homotopy quotient of X by S^1, i.e., $X_{S^1} = S^\infty \times_{S^1} X$, where S^∞ is the unit sphere in an infinite dimensional complex Hilbert space. In this paper we use $\mathbf{Q}$ coefficients for all homological and cohomological modules. By $t \to a^+$, we mean $t > a$ and $t \to a$.

2 A variational structure for closed characteristics on compact star-shaped hypersurfaces

In Section 2 and 3, we fix a $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{st}(2n)$.

As in Sections V.2 and V.3 of [Eke], we consider the following fixed period problem

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) &= JH'_\alpha(x(t)), \\ x(0) &= x(1). \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

Then solutions of (2.1) are $x \equiv 0$ and $x = \tau^{-\frac{1}{2-\alpha}} y(\tau t)$, where (τ, y) is a solution of (1.3).

For technical reasons (to get Proposition 2.5 below), we need to further modify the Hamiltonian, more precisely, we follow Page 624 of [Vit2], and let ϵ satisfy $\epsilon < 2\pi$, we can construct a function H, which coincides with H_α on $U_A = \{x \mid H_\alpha(x) \le A\}$ for some large A, and with $\frac{1}{2}\epsilon|x|^2$ outside some large ball, such that $\nabla H(x)$ does not vanish and $H''(x) < \epsilon$ outside U_A. As in Proposition 2.7 of [Vit2], we have the following result.

Proposition 2.1. *For small ϵ, there exists a function H on $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$ such that H is C^1 on $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$, and C^3 on $\mathbf{R}^{2n} \setminus \{0\}$, $H = H_\alpha$ in U_A, and $H(x) = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon|x|^2$ for $|x|$ large, and the solutions of the fixed period system*

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) &= JH'(x(t)), \\ x(0) &= x(1), \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

are the same with those of (2.1), i.e., the solutions of (2.2) are $x \equiv 0$ and $x = \tau^{-\frac{1}{2-\alpha}} y(\tau t)$, where (τ, y) is a solution of (1.3).

Note that the condition (2.2) of Lemma 2.2 of [Vit2] is only used to get Theorem 7.1 of [Vit2], so the other statements in [Vit2] also hold for our choice of the Hamiltonian function.

As in [BLMR] (cf. Section 3 of [Vit2]), we can choose some large constant K such that

$$H_K(x) = H(x) + \frac{1}{2}K|x|^2 \tag{2.3}$$

is a strictly convex function, that is,

$$(\nabla H_K(x) - \nabla H_K(y), x - y) \ge \frac{\epsilon}{2}|x - y|^2, \tag{2.4}$$

for all $x, y \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}$, and some positive ϵ. Let H_K^* be the Fenchel dual of H_K defined by

$$H_K^*(y) = \sup\{x \cdot y - H_K(x) \mid x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}\}. \tag{2.5}$$

The dual action functional on $X = W^{1,2}(\mathbf{R}/\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{R}^{2n})$ is defined by

$$F_K(x) = \int_0^1 \left[\frac{1}{2}(J\dot{x} - Kx, x) + H_K^*(-J\dot{x} + Kx)\right] dt. \tag{2.6}$$

Then we have

Lemma 2.2. (cf. Proposition 3.4 of [Vit2]) *Assume $K \notin 2\pi\mathbf{Z}$, then x is a critical point of F_K if and only if it is a solution of (2.2).*

As is well known, when $K \notin 2\pi\mathbf{Z}$, the map $x \mapsto -J\dot{x} + Kx$ is a Hilbert space isomorphism between $X = W^{1,2}(\mathbf{R}/\mathbf{Z}; \mathbf{R}^{2n})$ and $E = L^2(\mathbf{R}/\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{R}^{2n})$. We denote its inverse by M_K and the functional

$$\Psi_K(u) = \int_0^1 \left[-\frac{1}{2}(M_K u, u) + H_K^*(u)\right] dt, \qquad \forall\, u \in E. \tag{2.7}$$

Then $x \in X$ is a critical point of F_K if and only if $u = -J\dot{x} + Kx$ is a critical point of Ψ_K. We have a natural S^1-action on X or E defined by

$$\theta \cdot u(t) = u(\theta + t), \quad \forall\, \theta \in S^1,\, t \in \mathbf{R}. \tag{2.8}$$

Clearly both of F_K and Ψ_K are S^1-invariant. For any $\kappa \in \mathbf{R}$, we denote by

$$\Psi_K^\kappa = \{u \in L^2(\mathbf{R}/T\mathbf{Z}; \mathbf{R}^{2n}) \mid \Psi_K(u) \le \kappa\}.$$

Obviously, this level set is also S^1-invariant.

Definition 2.3. (cf. p.628 of [Vit2]) *Suppose u is a nonzero critical point of Ψ_K. Then the formal Hessian of Ψ_K at u is defined by*

$$Q_K(v) = \int_0^1 (-M_K v \cdot v + H_K^{*\prime\prime}(u)v \cdot v)dt, \tag{2.9}$$

which defines an orthogonal splitting $E = E_- \oplus E_0 \oplus E_+$ into negative, zero and positive subspaces. The index and nullity of u are defined by $i_K(u) = \dim E_-$ and $\nu_K(u) = \dim E_0$ respectively.

Similarly, we define the index and nullity of $x = M_K u$ for F_K, which are denoted by $i_K(x)$ and $\nu_K(x)$ respectively. Then we have

$$i_K(u) = i_K(x), \quad \nu_K(u) = \nu_K(x), \tag{2.10}$$

which follow from the definitions (2.6) and (2.7). The following important formula was proved in Lemma 6.4 of [Vit2]:

$$i_K(x) = 2n([K/2\pi] + 1) + i^v(x) \equiv d(K) + i^v(x), \tag{2.11}$$

where the Viterbo index $i^v(x)$ does not depend on K, but only on H.

By the proof of Proposition 2 of [Vit1], we have that $v \in E$ belongs to the null space of Q_K if and only if $z = M_K v$ is a solution of the linearized system

$$\dot{z}(t) = JH''(x(t))z(t). \tag{2.12}$$

Thus the nullity in (2.10) is independent of K, which we denote by $\nu^v(x) \equiv \nu_K(u) = \nu_K(x)$.

Since x is a solution of (2.1) corresponding to a solution (τ, y) of (1.3), we also denote $i^v(x)$ and $\nu^v(x)$ by $i^v(y)$ and $\nu^v(y)$ respectively, and define $i(y) := i^v(y)$ and $\nu(y) := \nu^v(y)$. By Theorem 2.1 of [HuL], we have:

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{st}(2n)$ and $(\tau, y) \in \mathcal{T}(\Sigma)$. Then we have*

$$i(y^m) = i(y, m) - n, \quad \nu(y^m) = \nu(y, m), \qquad \forall m \in \mathbf{N},$$

where $i(y, m)$ and $\nu(y, m)$ are the Maslov-type index and nullity of $(m\tau, y)$.

By Propositions 3.9, 4.1 of [Vit2] and the same proof of Proposition 2.12 of [LLW], we have:

Proposition 2.5. *Ψ_K satisfies the Palais-Smale condition on E, and F_K satisfies the Palais-Smale condition on X, when $K \notin 2\pi\mathbf{Z}$.*

3 Fadell-Rabinowitz index theory for closed characteristics on star-shaped hypersurfaces

3.1 Critical values in the free case

Recall that for a principal $U(1)$-bundle $E \to B$, the Fadell-Rabinowitz index (cf. [FaR]) of E is defined to be $\sup\{k \mid c_1(E)^{k-1} \neq 0\}$, where $c_1(E) \in H^2(B, \mathbf{Q})$ is the first rational Chern class. For a $U(1)$-space, i.e., a topological space X with a $U(1)$-action, the Fadell-Rabinowitz index is defined to be the index of the bundle $X \times S^\infty \to X \times_{U(1)} S^\infty$, where $S^\infty \to CP^\infty$ is the universal $U(1)$-bundle.

For any $\kappa \in \mathbf{R}$, we denote by

$$\Psi_K^{\kappa-} = \{u \in L^2(\mathbf{R}/\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{R}^{2n}) \mid \Psi_K(u) < \kappa\}. \tag{3.1}$$

Then as in P.218 of [Eke], we define

$$c_i = \inf\{\delta \in \mathbf{R} \mid \hat{I}(\Psi_K^{\delta-}) \geq i\}, i \in \mathbf{N}. \tag{3.2}$$

where $\hat{I}$ is the Fadell-Rabinowitz index given above.

For $i \geq d(K)/2 + 1$, where $d(K) = 2n([K/2\pi] + 1)$, c_i is well defined. In fact, by Proposition 5.7 of [Vit2], there exists constant c such that Ψ_K^c is S^1-equivariant homotopy equivalent with a $(d(K) - 1)$ dimensional sphere. Then $\hat{I}(\Psi_K^c) = d(K)/2$. Hence for $i \geq d(K)/2 + 1$, $c_i \geq c$ is well defined.

Then similar to Proposition 3 in P.218 of [Eke], we have

Proposition 3.1. *For $i \geq d(K)/2 + 1$, c_i is a critical value of Ψ_K.*

Proof. For the reader's convenience, we sketch a brief proof here and refer to Sections V.2 and V.3 of [Eke] for related details.

By the proof of Theorem V.2.9 of [Eke], if we replace L_o^β and ψ by $L^2(\mathbf{R}/\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{R}^{2n})$ and Ψ_K respectively, the Theorem V.2.9 of [Eke] also works. Since the Fadell-Rabinowitz index $\hat{I}$ has the properties of monotonicity, subadditivity, continuity which are the only three properties of I used in the proof of Proposition V.2.10 of [Eke], then the proof carries over verbatim of that of Proposition V.2.10 of [Eke]. ∎

Note that here we can't get $c_i \neq 0$ and prove Proposition 3.5 below, because it depends on Proposition 3.4 and the identity (3.10) below, but we should firstly prove Proposition 3.1 and 3.3 in order to get the identity (3.10) by the method of Lemma V.3.8 of [Eke].

Definition 3.2. *Suppose u is a nonzero critical point of Ψ_K, and $\mathcal{N}$ is an S^1-invariant open neighborhood of $S^1 \cdot u$ such that $crit(\Psi_K) \cap (\Lambda_K(u) \cap \mathcal{N}) = S^1 \cdot u$. Then the S^1-critical modules of $S^1 \cdot u$ is defined by*

$$C_{S^1,\,q}(\Psi_K,\ S^1 \cdot u) = H_q((\Lambda_K(u) \cap \mathcal{N})_{S^1},\ ((\Lambda_K(u) \setminus S^1 \cdot u) \cap \mathcal{N})_{S^1}), \tag{3.3}$$

where $\Lambda_K(u) = \{w \in L^2(\mathbf{R}/\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{R}^{2n}) \mid \Psi_K(w) \leq \Psi_K(u)\}$.

Comparing with Theorem 4 in P.219 of [Eke], we have the following

Proposition 3.3. *For every $i \geq d(K)/2+1$, there exists a point $u \in L^2(\mathbf{R}/\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{R}^{2n})$ such that*

$$\Psi'_K(u) = 0, \quad \Psi_K(u) = c_i, \tag{3.4}$$

$$C_{S^1,\,2(i-1)}(\Psi_K,\ S^1 \cdot u) \neq 0. \tag{3.5}$$

Proof. By Lemma 8 in P.206 of [Eke], we can use Theorem 1.4.2 of [Cha] in the equivariant form to obtain

$$H_{S^1,\,*}(\Psi_K^{c_i+\epsilon},\ \Psi_K^{c_i-\epsilon}) = \bigoplus_{\Psi_K(u)=c_i} C_{S^1,\,*}(\Psi_K,\ S^1 \cdot u), \tag{3.6}$$

for ϵ small enough such that the interval $(c_i-\epsilon,\ c_i+\epsilon)$ contains no critical values of Ψ_K except c_i.

Similar to P.431 of [EkH], we have

$$H^{2(i-1)}((\Psi_K^{c_i+\epsilon})_{S^1},\ (\Psi_K^{c_i-\epsilon})_{S^1}) \xrightarrow{q^*} H^{2(i-1)}((\Psi_K^{c_i+\epsilon})_{S^1}) \xrightarrow{p^*} H^{2(i-1)}((\Psi_K^{c_i-\epsilon})_{S^1}), \tag{3.7}$$

where p and q are natural inclusions. Denote by $f : (\Psi_K^{c_i+\epsilon})_{S^1} \to CP^\infty$ a classifying map and let $f^\pm = f|_{(\Psi_K^{c_i\pm\epsilon})_{S^1}}$. Then clearly each $f^\pm : (\Psi_K^{c_i\pm\epsilon})_{S^1} \to CP^\infty$ is a classifying map on $(\Psi_K^{c_i\pm\epsilon})_{S^1}$. Let $\eta \in H^2(CP^\infty)$ be the first universal Chern class.

By definition of c_i, we have $\hat{I}(\Psi_K^{c_i-\epsilon}) < i$, hence $(f^-)^*(\eta^{i-1}) = 0$. Note that $p^*(f^+)^*(\eta^{i-1}) = (f^-)^*(\eta^{i-1})$. Hence the exactness of (3.7) yields a $\sigma \in H^{2(i-1)}((\Psi_K^{c_i+\epsilon})_{S^1},\ (\Psi_K^{c_i-\epsilon})_{S^1})$ such that $q^*(\sigma) = (f^+)^*(\eta^{i-1})$. Since $\hat{I}(\Psi_K^{c_i+\epsilon}) \geq i$, we have $(f^+)^*(\eta^{i-1}) \neq 0$. Hence $\sigma \neq 0$, and then

$$H_{S^1}^{2(i-1)}(\Psi_K^{c_i+\epsilon}, \Psi_K^{c_i-\epsilon}) = H^{2(i-1)}((\Psi_K^{c_i+\epsilon})_{S^1},\ (\Psi_K^{c_i-\epsilon})_{S^1}) \neq 0.$$

Thus the proposition follows from (3.6) and the universal coefficient theorem. ∎

Now we define two numbers $\gamma_\alpha^+(\Sigma)$ and $\gamma_\alpha^-(\Sigma)$ by:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_\alpha^+(\Sigma) &= \limsup_{i\to\infty} [(-c_i)^{\frac{2-\alpha}{\alpha}} i]^{-1}, \\ \gamma_\alpha^-(\Sigma) &= \liminf_{i\to\infty} [(-c_i)^{\frac{2-\alpha}{\alpha}} i]^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

and we set

$$\gamma^+(\Sigma) = \frac{\alpha}{4}(1-\frac{\alpha}{2})^{\frac{2-\alpha}{\alpha}} \gamma_\alpha^+(\Sigma), \tag{3.8}$$

$$\gamma^-(\Sigma) = \frac{\alpha}{4}(1-\frac{\alpha}{2})^{\frac{2-\alpha}{\alpha}} \gamma_\alpha^-(\Sigma). \tag{3.9}$$

Then by the proofs of Lemma V.3.8 of [Eke] and Proposition 2.8 of [LLW], noticing that when Σ is convex, the Viterbo index $i^v(y)$ and nullity $\nu^v(y)$ are the same as Ekeland index and nullity, we have

$$\gamma^+(\Sigma_R) = \gamma^-(\Sigma_R) = \frac{\pi R^2}{2n}, \tag{3.10}$$

where Σ_R is the sphere of radius R in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$.

Proposition 3.4. *We have $0 < \gamma^-(\Sigma) \leq \gamma^+(\Sigma) < +\infty$ for any $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{st}(2n)$.*

Proof. Since Σ is star-shaped, there exist some $0 < r < R$ such that

$$R^{-\alpha}|x|^{\alpha} \leq H_{\alpha}(x) \leq r^{-\alpha}|x|^{\alpha}. \tag{3.11}$$

We denote the modified Hamiltonian functions of $R^{-\alpha}|x|^{\alpha}$ and $r^{-\alpha}|x|^{\alpha}$ in Proposition 2.1 by $H_R(x)$ and $H_r(x)$ respectively, and we can also choose the functions to satisfy

$$H_R(x) \leq H(x) \leq H_r(x), \forall x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}, \tag{3.12}$$

where $H(x)$ is the modified Hamiltonian function of $H_{\alpha}(x)$.

Denote by Ψ_K^r and Ψ_K^R the corresponding dual action functionals defined in (2.7) associated with the Hamiltonians H_r and H_R respectively, then by (3.12) we have

$$\Psi_K^r \leq \Psi_K \leq \Psi_K^R. \tag{3.13}$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} c_i(r) &= \inf\{\delta \mid \widehat{I}((\Psi_K^r)^{\delta-}) \geq i\} \\ c_i(R) &= \inf\{\delta \mid \widehat{I}((\Psi_K^R)^{\delta-}) \geq i\} \end{aligned}$$

Then $c_i(r) \leq c_i \leq c_i(R)$ from (3.13). Thus by definitions (3.8), (3.9), we have

$$\gamma^+(\Sigma_r) \leq \gamma^+(\Sigma) \leq \gamma^+(\Sigma_R), \tag{3.14}$$

$$\gamma^-(\Sigma_r) \leq \gamma^-(\Sigma) \leq \gamma^-(\Sigma_R). \tag{3.15}$$

Hence by (3.10), (3.14) and (3.15), we obtain $\frac{\pi r^2}{2n} \leq \gamma^-(\Sigma) \leq \gamma^+(\Sigma) \leq \frac{\pi R^2}{2n}$. ∎

Proposition 3.5. *If $c_i = c_j$ for some $d(K)/2 + 1 \leq i < j$, then there are infinitely many geometrically distinct closed characteristics on Σ.*

Proof. Note that by Proposition 3.4, we have $c_i \neq 0$, $i \geq d(K)/2 + 1$. Then by the same proof of Proposition V.3.3 of [Eke], we prove our proposition. ∎

Since every solution $(\tau, y) \in \mathcal{T}(\Sigma, \alpha)$ gives rise to a sequence $\{z_m^y\}_{m\in\mathbf{N}}$ of solutions of the given period-1 problem (2.1), and a sequence $\{u_m^y\}_{m\in\mathbf{N}}$ of critical points of Ψ_K defined by

$$z_m^y(t) = (m\tau)^{-\frac{1}{2-\alpha}} y(m\tau t), \tag{3.16}$$

$$u_m^y(t) = -J(m\tau)^{-\frac{\alpha-1}{2-\alpha}} \dot{y}(m\tau t) + K(m\tau)^{-\frac{1}{2-\alpha}} y(m\tau t) \tag{3.17}$$

From the proof of Proposition 2.8 of [LLW], we know that $\Psi_K(u_m^y)$ is independent of K, together with (V.3.45) of [Eke], it follows that

$$\Psi_K(u_m^y) = -(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}) \left(\frac{2}{\alpha} k A(y)\right)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2-\alpha}}, \tag{3.18}$$

where the action of a closed characteristic (τ, y) is defined by

$$A(y) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\tau} (Jy \cdot \dot{y}) dt.$$

Corollary 3.6. *We have* $\lim_{i\to\infty} c_i = 0$ *and for every* $i \in \mathbf{N}$*, there exists* $(\tau, y) \in \mathcal{T}(\Sigma, \alpha)$ *and* $m \in \mathbf{N}$ *such that*

$$\Psi'_K(u^y_m) = 0, \quad \Psi_K(u^y_m) = c_{i+d(K)/2}, \tag{3.19}$$

$$i^v(y^m) \le 2(i-1) \le i^v(y^m) + \nu^v(y^m) - 1, \tag{3.20}$$

where u^y_m *is defined as in (3.17).*

Definition 3.7. *We call* $(\tau, y) \in \mathcal{T}(\Sigma, \alpha)$ *is* i*-essential if there exists some* $m \in \mathbf{N}$ *such that (3.19), (3.20) hold. It is essential if it is* i*-essential for some* $i \in \mathbf{N}$*. We denote by* $\mathcal{C}$ *the family of essential closed characteristics on* Σ*.*

Theorem 3.8. *We have* $[1/\gamma^+(\Sigma), 1/\gamma^-(\Sigma)] \subseteq$ *the closure of* $\{\frac{\hat{i}(y)}{A(y)} \mid y \in \mathcal{C}\}$*, where* $\hat{i}(y) \equiv \lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{i(y^m)}{m}$ *is the mean index of* (τ, y)*.*

The proof of Theorem 3.8 relies on the following:

Lemma 3.9. *There exists constant* d*, which only depends on* Σ*, such that whenever* $y \in \mathcal{C}$ *is* i*-essential for some* $i \in \mathbf{N}$*, we have*

$$\left| \frac{1}{C_\alpha} \frac{\hat{i}(y)}{A(y)} - (d(K)/2 + i)|c_{d(K)/2+i}|^{\frac{2-\alpha}{\alpha}} \right| \le d|c_{d(K)/2+i}|^{\frac{2-\alpha}{\alpha}},$$

where $C_\alpha = \frac{4}{\alpha}(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2})^{-\frac{2-\alpha}{\alpha}}$*.*

Proof. By Theorem 10.1.1, 10.1.2 of [Lon2] and Lemma 2.4, the Viterbo index $i^v(y)$ has the property of Proposition I.5.21 of [Eke], note that Theorem V.1.4 of [Eke] also holds for star-shaped hypersurfaces, then our lemma follows by the same proof of Lemma V.3.12 of [Eke]. ∎

Proof of Theorem 3.8. From Lemma 3.9 instead of Lemma V.3.12 of [Eke], our theorem follows by the same proof of Theorem V.3.11 of [Eke]. ∎

Now by the same proof of Theorem V.3.15 of [Eke], we obtain

Theorem 3.10. *If* $\mathcal{C}$ *is finite. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} &\gamma(\Sigma) \equiv \gamma^+(\Sigma) = \gamma^-(\Sigma), \\ &\frac{\hat{i}(y)}{A(y)} = \frac{1}{\gamma(\Sigma)}, \ \forall y \in \mathcal{C}, \\ &\sum_{y\in\mathcal{C}} \frac{1}{\hat{i}(y)} \ge \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

By (3.21), we have

Corollary 3.11. *If there is a closed characteristic on* $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{st}(2n)$ *whose mean index is greater than 2, then there exist at least two closed characteristics on* Σ*.*

3.2 Critical values in the pinched case

In this subsection, we prove under suitable pinching condition, the critical values $c_{i+d(K)/2}$ found in Subsection 3.1 correspond to n distinct closed characteristics for $1 \le i \le n$.

Let $n(y)$ be the unit outward normal vector of Σ at y and $d(y) := n(y) \cdot y$, i.e., the distance between the origin of $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$ and the tangent hyperplane to Σ at y, then $d(y) > 0$ for all $y \in \Sigma$ since Σ is strictly star-shaped. Let $d = \min\{d(y) : y \in \Sigma\}$, $R = \max\{|y| : y \in \Sigma\}$. Then we have

Theorem 3.12. *Suppose that Σ satisfies the pinching condition $R^2 < 2d^2$, then the critical values $c_{i+d(K)/2}$ found in Proposition 3.1 and Corollary 3.6 correspond to at least n distinct closed characteristics for $1 \le i \le n$.*

Proof. We carry out our proof in two steps:

Step 1. *We have*

$$c_{i+d(K)/2} \le -(1-\frac{\alpha}{2})(\frac{\alpha}{2\pi R^2})^{\frac{\alpha}{2-\alpha}}, \quad \forall\ 1 \le i \le n. \tag{3.22}$$

In fact, when $\Sigma = \Sigma_R$ is the sphere of radius R in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$, by the proofs of Lemma V.3.8 of [Eke] and Proposition 2.8 of [LLW], noticing that when Σ is convex, the Viterbo index $i^v(y)$ and nullity $\nu^v(y)$ are the same as Ekeland index and nullity, we obtain that the corresponding critical values $c^R_{i+d(K)/2}$ found in Proposition 3.1 and Corollary 3.6 satisfy

$$c^R_{i+d(K)/2} = -(1-\frac{\alpha}{2})(\frac{\alpha}{2\pi R^2})^{\frac{\alpha}{2-\alpha}}, \quad \forall 1 \le i \le n,$$

which, together with (3.2) and (3.13), yields (3.22).

Step 2. *We have*

$$c_{i+d(K)/2} \ge (1-\frac{\alpha}{2})(\frac{\alpha}{2\pi d^2})^{\frac{\alpha}{2-\alpha}}, \quad \forall 1 \le i \le n. \tag{3.23}$$

In fact, when we replace r in the proof of Theorem V.1.4 of [Eke] by d, then Theorem V.1.4 of [Eke] holds for star-shaped hypersurface Σ, i.e., for every closed characteristic (τ, y) on star-shaped hypersurface Σ, there holds $A(\tau, y) \ge \pi d^2$, which, together with (3.18), yields (3.23).

Now, combining (3.22)-(3.23), (3.18) and $R^2 < 2d^2$, by Proposition 3.5 we obtain that the critical values $c_{i+d(K)/2}$ correspond to at least n distinct closed characteristics for $1 \le i \le n$. ∎

4 Proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.4-1.5

In this section, we prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.4-1.5.

Lemma 4.1. (cf. Proposition 6.2 of [LLo2]) *Let $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{st}(4)$ satisfy ${}^{\#}\mathcal{T}(\Sigma) = 2$. Denote the two geometrically distinct prime closed characteristics by $\{(\tau_j,\ y_j)\}_{1\le j\le 2}$. If $i(y_j) \ge 0, j = 1, 2$, then both of the closed characteristics are elliptic.*

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{st}(4)$ satisfy ${}^{\#}\mathcal{T}(\Sigma) = 2$ and $R^2 < 2d^2$, we denote by $\{(\tau_1,\ y_1),\ (\tau_2,\ y_2)\}$ the two geometrically distinct prime closed characteristics on Σ, and by

$\gamma_j \equiv \gamma_{y_j}$ the associated symplectic paths of $(\tau_j,\ y_j)$ for $1 \le j \le 2$. Then by Lemma 3.3 of [HuL] (cf. also Lemma 15.2.4 of [Lon2]), there exist $P_j \in \mathrm{Sp}(4)$ and $M_j \in \mathrm{Sp}(2)$ such that

$$\gamma_j(\tau_j) = P_j^{-1}(N_1(1,\,1) \diamond M_j)P_j, \quad \text{for } \ j = 1, 2. \tag{4.1}$$

Note that by Section 9 of [Vit2], we know that there exists at least one non-hyperbolic closed characteristic on Σ and it is certainly elliptic when $n = 2$. In the following, we prove Theorem 1.1 by contradiction. Without loss of generality, we assume that (τ_1, y_1) is elliptic and (τ_2, y_2) is hyperbolic.

For these two closed characteristics, we have the following properties:

Claim 1. *The closed characteristics (τ_1, y_1), (τ_2, y_2) satisfy*
(i) $i(y_2^m) = m(i(y_2) + 3) - 3$ and $\nu(y_2^m) = 1$, $\forall\ m \in \mathbf{N}$, and thus $\hat{i}(y_2) = i(y_2) + 3$.
(ii) $\hat{i}(y_2) > 0$.
(iii) $\hat{i}(y_1) \in \mathbf{Q}$.
(iv) If $i(y_2)$ is even, then $i(y_2^2) - i(y_2) \in 2\mathbf{Z} - 1$, $\hat{\chi}(y_2) = \frac{1}{2}$, and $i(y_2) \ge -2$.

In fact, by Theorem 8.3.1 of [Lon2], we have $i(y_2, m) = m(i(y_2, 1) + 1) - 1$, $\forall\ m \in \mathbf{N}$. Together with Lemma 2.4, we obtain (i).

We claim $\hat{i}(y_2) \neq 0$. In fact, because y_2 is hyperbolic, y_2^m is non-degenerate for every $m \ge 1$. Thus if $\hat{i}(y_2) = 0$, we then have $i(y_2^m) = i(y_2, m) - 2 = -3$ for all $m \ge 1$. Then the Morse-type number satisfies $m_{-3} = +\infty$. But then $\hat{i}(y_1)$ must be positive by Theorem 5.6, and contributions of $\{y_1^m\}$ to every Morse-type number thus must be finite. Then the Morse inequality yields a contradiction and proves the claim (cf. the proof below (9.3) of [Vit2] for details).

If $\hat{i}(y_2) < 0$, by (5.24) we obtain

$$\frac{\hat{\chi}(y_2)}{\hat{i}(y_2)} = 0. \tag{4.2}$$

But because (τ_2, y_2) is hyperbolic, by (5.22) we have $\hat{\chi}(y_2) \neq 0$, which contradicts to (4.2) and proves (ii).

If (τ_1, y_1) and its iterates are all non-degenerate, since (τ_1, y_1) is elliptic, then $\hat{i}(y_1)$ must be irrational by Corollary 8.3.2 of [Lon2] and then so is $\frac{\hat{\chi}(y_1)}{\hat{i}(y_1)}$, because $\hat{\chi}(y_1)$ is rational and nonzero by (5.22). Then by (5.23) of Theorem 5.6, the other closed characteristic (τ_2, y_2) must possess an irrational mean index $\hat{i}(y_2)$, which contradicts to the second identity in (i), and thus $\hat{i}(y_1)$ must be rational, which proves (iii).

If $i(y_2)$ is even, then $i(y_2^2) - i(y_2) = i(y_2) + 3 \in 2\mathbf{Z} - 1$ by (i), which together (5.22) implies $\hat{\chi}(y_2) = \frac{1}{2}$. Then $i(y_2) \ge -2$ follows from (i) and (ii).

The proof of Claim 1 is complete.

By (iii) of Claim 1, we only need to consider the following four cases according to the classification of basic norm forms of $\gamma_1(\tau_1)$. In the following we use the notations from Definition 1.8.5 and Theorem 1.8.10 of [Lon2], and specially we let $R(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta & -\sin\theta \\ \sin\theta & \cos\theta \end{pmatrix}$ with $\theta \in \mathbf{R}$, and use

$M\diamond N$ to denote the symplectic direct sum of two symplectic matrices M and N as in pages 16-17 of [Lon2].

Case 1. *$\gamma_1(\tau_1)$ can be connected to $N_1(1,1)\diamond N_1(-1,b)$ within $\Omega^0(\gamma_1(\tau_1))$ with $b=0$ or ± 1.*

In this case, by Theorems 8.1.4 and 8.1.5 of [Lon2], and Lemma 2.4, we have

$$i(y_1,1) \quad \text{and} \quad i(y_1) \quad \text{are even.} \tag{4.3}$$

By Theorem 1.3 of [Lon1], we have

$$\begin{aligned} i(y_1,m) &= m(i(y_1,1)+1)-1, \quad \text{for } b=1; \\ i(y_1,m) &= m(i(y_1,1)+1)-1-\frac{1+(-1)^m}{2}, \quad \text{for } b=0,-1. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.4, we obtain

$$i(y_1^m) = m(i(y_1)+3)-3, \quad \text{for } b=1; \tag{4.4}$$

$$i(y_1^m) = m(i(y_1)+3)-3-\frac{1+(-1)^m}{2}, \quad \text{for } b=0,-1. \tag{4.5}$$

Then in both cases we obtain

$$\hat{i}(y_1) = i(y_1)+3. \tag{4.6}$$

Next we separate our proof in two subcases according to the parity of $i(y_2)$.

Subcase 1.1. *$i(y_2)$ is even.*

By (iv) of Claim 1, we have $i(y_2)\geq 0$ or $i(y_2)=-2$. We continue our proof in two steps according to the value of $i(y_2)$:

Step 1.1. $i(y_2)\geq 0$.

In this step, by (i) of Claim 1 we have

$$\hat{i}(y_2)\geq 3, \tag{4.7}$$

which together with (iv) of Claim 1 implies

$$\frac{\hat{\chi}(y_2)}{\hat{i}(y_2)}\leq \frac{1}{6}. \tag{4.8}$$

Combining (4.8) with Theorem 5.6, we obtain

$$\hat{i}(y_1)>0, \quad \frac{\hat{\chi}(y_1)}{\hat{i}(y_1)}=\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\hat{\chi}(y_2)}{\hat{i}(y_2)}\geq \frac{1}{3}. \tag{4.9}$$

Note that by Proposition 5.4 and the form of $\gamma_1(\tau_1)$, we have $K(y_1)=2$. Thus by (5.21) and (4.9), we obtain

$$0<\hat{\chi}(y_1)=\frac{1+(-1)^{i(y_1^2)}(k_0(y_1^2)-k_1(y_1^2)+k_2(y_1^2))}{2}. \tag{4.10}$$

Since at most one of $k_l(y_1^2)$s for $0 \le l \le 2$ can be non-zero by (iv) of Remark 5.5, we obtain

$$(-1)^{i(y_1^2)+l} k_l(y_1^2) \ge 0, \qquad \text{for } \ l = 0, 1, 2. \tag{4.11}$$

When m is odd, we have $\nu(x_1^m) = 1$ by the assumption on $\gamma_1(\tau_1)$. In this case, because $i(y_1)$ is even by (4.3), we have $i^v(x_1^m) = i(y_1^m) = m(i(y_1)+3) - 3$ is even, and then

$$\beta(x^m) = (-1)^{i^v(x_1^m) - i^v(x_1)} = 1,$$

where we denote by x_j the critical point of $F_{a,K}$ corresponding to y_j for $j = 1$ and 2. Thus by (5.17) of Proposition 5.2 for every odd $m \in \mathbf{N}$, we obtain

$$C_{S^1,\, d(K)+k}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_1^m) = \mathbf{Q}, \qquad \text{if } \ k = i(y_1^m), \tag{4.12}$$

$$C_{S^1,\, d(K)+k}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_1^m) = 0, \qquad \text{if } k \ne i(y_1^m), \tag{4.13}$$

where (4.13) holds specially when $k \in 2\mathbf{Z} - 1$.

When m is even, we consider two cases: (A-1) for $b = 0, -1$ with (4.5); (B-1) $b = 1$ with (4.4).

(A-1) *m is even, $b = 0$ or -1, and (4.5) holds.*

In this case, $i(y_1^2)$ is even by (4.5). Therefore by (4.10)-(4.11) we obtain

$$k_1(y^2) = 0, \quad \hat{\chi}(y_1) = \frac{1 + (k_0(y_1^2) + k_2(y_1^2))}{2} > 0. \tag{4.14}$$

Because $K(y_1) = 2$, we then obtain

$$C_{S^1,\, d(K)+2k-1}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_1^m) = 0, \qquad \forall k \in \mathbf{Z}, m \in 2\mathbf{N}. \tag{4.15}$$

Therefore, when $b = 0, -1$, from (4.12), (4.13) and (4.15) we obtain

$$C_{S^1,\, d(K)+2k-1}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_1^m) = 0, \qquad \forall k \in \mathbf{Z}, m \in \mathbf{N}. \tag{4.16}$$

(B-1) *m is even, $b = 1$, and (4.4) holds.*

In this case, $i(y_1^2)$ is odd by (4.4). Therefore by (4.10)-(4.11) we obtain

$$k_0(y^2) = k_2(y^2) = 0, \quad 0 < \hat{\chi}(y_1) = \frac{1 + k_1(y_1^2)}{2}. \tag{4.17}$$

Because $K(y_1) = 2$, we then obtain

$$C_{S^1,\, d(K)+2k-1}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_1^m) = 0, \qquad \forall k \in \mathbf{Z}, m \in 2\mathbf{N}. \tag{4.18}$$

Therefore when $b = 1$, from (4.12), (4.13) and (4.18), we obtain

$$C_{S^1,\, d(K)+2k-1}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_1^m) = 0, \qquad \forall k \in \mathbf{Z}, m \in \mathbf{N}. \tag{4.19}$$

In summary, from (4.16) and (4.19), for any case we have

$$C_{S^1,\, d(K)+2k-1}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_1^m) = 0, \qquad \forall k \in \mathbf{Z}, m \in \mathbf{N}. \tag{4.20}$$

Note that in Subcase 1.1, $i(y_2)$ is even and (τ_2, y_2) is hyperbolic, then by (5.17) of Proposition 5.2, we obtain

$$C_{S^1,\, d(K)+2k-1}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_2^m) = 0, \qquad \forall k \in \mathbf{Z}, m \in \mathbf{N}. \tag{4.21}$$

Combining (4.20) and (4.21), we have $m_{2q-1} = 0$ for every $q \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $U(t) \equiv 0$ in (5.28). Here and below in this Section m_i denotes the coefficient of t^i of $M(t) = \sum_{i\in\mathbf{Z}} m_i t^i$ in (5.28). Then

$$\sum_{i\in\mathbf{Z}} m_i t^i = \frac{1}{1-t^2} = \sum_{i\in\mathbf{N}} t^{2i-2}.$$

Thus $i(y_j) \geq 0$ for $j = 1, 2$ by Proposition 5.2. By Lemma 4.1 we know that the two closed characteristics are elliptic, which contradicts to our assumption.

Step 1.2. $i(y_2) = -2$.

In this step, by (i) of Claim 1 we have

$$\hat{i}(y_2) = 1, \tag{4.22}$$

which together with (iv) of Claim 1 implies

$$\frac{\hat{\chi}(y_2)}{\hat{i}(y_2)} = \frac{1}{2}. \tag{4.23}$$

We continue in two cases: (A-2) $i(y_1) = -2$; (B-2) $i(y_1) \leq -4$ or $i(y_1) \geq 0$.

(A-2) *$i(y_1) = -2$ holds.*

In this case, by (4.6) we have

$$\hat{i}(y_1) = 1, \tag{4.24}$$

Combining (4.22), (4.24) with Theorem 5.6, we obtain

$$\frac{\hat{\chi}(y_1)}{\hat{i}(y_1)} + \frac{\hat{\chi}(y_2)}{\hat{i}(y_2)} = \frac{1}{2}, \tag{4.25}$$

which together with (4.24) implies

$$\hat{\chi}(y_1) = 0. \tag{4.26}$$

Since $i(y_1) = -2$ and $i(y_2) = -2$ in this case, there hold $i(c_k^m) \geq -2$, $\forall\ m \geq 1$, $k = 1, 2$. Then by (5.16)-(5.17) of Proposition 5.2, (4.4)-(4.5) and (i) of Claim 1, we obtain $m_{-2} \geq 2$ and $m_q = 0$ for $q < -2$, which together with (5.28) gives

$$m_{-1} = u_{-2} + u_{-1} = m_{-2} + u_{-1} \geq 2. \tag{4.27}$$

On the other hand, by (i) of Claim 1, $i(y_2^m) = m - 3$, then by (5.17) of Proposition 5.2, we get

$$C_{S^1,\, d(K)-1}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_2^m) = 0, \quad \forall m \in \mathbf{N}, \tag{4.28}$$

which, together with (4.27), implies that y_1^m has contribution to m_{-1} for some $m \in \mathbf{N}$ and y_2^m has no contribution to m_{-1} for all $m \in \mathbf{N}$. Note that by (4.4)-(4.5) and Proposition 5.2, then we have $m_{-1} = k_0(y_1^2) \geq 2$ when $b = 1$ and (4.4) holds, or $m_{-1} = k_1(y_1^2) \geq 2$ when $b = 0$ or -1, and (4.5) holds. Together with (iv) of Remark 5.5, (4.27) and (5.21), it yields

$$\hat{\chi}(y_1) = \frac{1 + (-1)^{i(y_1^2)}(k_0(y_1^2) - k_1(y_1^2) + k_2(y_1^2))}{2} \neq 0,$$

which contradicts to (4.26).

(B-2) *$i(y_1) \leq -4$ or $i(y_1) \geq 0$ holds.*

In this case, by (4.4)-(4.5) and Proposition 5.2, y_1^m has no contribution to m_{-1} and m_{-3} for all $m \in \mathbf{N}$. Note that $i(y_2^m) = m - 3$ in Step 2, then by Proposition 5.2, y_2^m has no contribution to m_{-1} and m_{-3} for all $m \in \mathbf{N}$ too. Thus $m_{-1} = m_{-3} = 0$, which together with (5.28) gives

$$m_{-2} = 0. \tag{4.29}$$

Since $i(y_2) = -2$, then by Proposition 5.2, we have $C_{S^1,\, d(K)-2}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_2) = \mathbf{Q}$ which implies $m_{-2} > 0$, it contradicts to (4.29).

Subcase 1.2. *$i(y_2)$ is odd.*

In this subcase, by (i)-(ii) of Claim 1, we have $i(y_2) \geq -1$ and it is odd. When $i(y_2) \geq 1$, then by the same proof of Subcase 1.1 of Theorem 1.4 in [LLo2], we get a contradiction. Thus we can assume that $i(y_2) = -1$. Then by (i) of Claim 1, we have $i(y_2^m) = 2m - 3$, it together with Proposition 5.2 gives $C_{S^1,\, d(K)+2i-2}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_2^m) = 0$, $\forall\ m \geq 1$, $i = 1, 2$. On the other hand, by Proposition 3.3 and Theorem 3.12, we have $C_{S^1,\, d(K)+2i-2}(\Psi_K,\ S^1 \cdot u^{y_2}) \neq 0$ for $i = 1$ or $i = 2$, where u^{y_2} is the critical point of Ψ_K corresponding to y_2. By the same proof of Proposition 3.6 of [Wan1], we have $C_{S^1,\, d(K)+2i-2}(\Psi_K,\ S^1 \cdot u^{y_2}) \cong C_{S^1,\, d(K)+2i-2}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_2)$, it is a contradiction.

Case 2. *$\gamma_1(\tau_1)$ can be connected to $N_1(1,1) \diamond R(\theta)$ within $\Omega^0(\gamma_1(\tau_1))$ with some $\theta \in (0,\pi) \cup (\pi, 2\pi)$ and $\theta/\pi \in \mathbf{Q}$.*

In this case, we have always $K(y_1) \geq 3$ by the definition of θ. By Theorems 8.1.4 and 8.1.7 of [Lon2] and Lemma 2.4 we obtain

$$i(y_1, 1) \quad \text{and} \quad i(y_1) \quad \text{are even.} \tag{4.30}$$

By Theorem 1.3 of [Lon1] (i.e., Theorem 8.3.1 of [Lon2]), we have

$$i(y_1, m) = mi(y_1, 1) + 2E(\frac{m\theta}{2\pi}) - 2, \quad \forall\ m \geq 1,$$

which, together with Lemma 2.4, yields

$$i(y_1^m) = m(i(y_1) + 2) + 2E(\frac{m\theta}{2\pi}) - 4, \quad \forall\ m \geq 1. \tag{4.31}$$

Then

$$\hat{i}(y_1) = i(y_1) + 2 + \frac{\theta}{\pi}. \tag{4.32}$$

We have two subcases according to the parity of $i(y_2)$.

Subcase 2.1. *$i(y_2)$ is odd.*

For this case, as the same proof of Case 2 of Theorem 1.4 in [LLo2], we can get a contradiction.

Subcase 2.2. *$i(y_2)$ is even.*

Next we continue our proof in two steps according to the value of $i(y_1) \in 2\mathbf{Z}$ by (4.30).

Step 2.1. $i(y_1) \leq -4$.

In this step, by (4.32), we have $\hat{i}(y_1) < 0$, together with Theorem 5.6, we obtain

$$\frac{\hat{\chi}(y_2)}{\hat{i}(y_2)} = \frac{1}{2}, \tag{4.33}$$

and

$$\frac{\hat{\chi}(y_1)}{\hat{i}(y_1)} = 0, \tag{4.34}$$

which implies

$$\hat{\chi}(y_1) = 0. \tag{4.35}$$

By (4.33) and (iv) of Claim 1, we get $\hat{i}(y_2) = 1$, which, together with (i) of Claim 1, implies

$$i(y_2) = -2. \tag{4.36}$$

By (5.21), we have

$$\hat{\chi}(y_1) \;=\; \frac{K(y_1) - 1 + k_0(y_1^{K(y_1)}) - k_1(y_1^{K(y_1)}) + k_2(y_1^{K(y_1)})}{K(y_1)}, \tag{4.37}$$

which, together with (iv) of Remark 5.5 and (4.35), yields

$$k_1(y_1^{K(y_1)}) = K(y_1) - 1 > 0, \quad k_0(y_1^{K(y_1)}) = k_2(y_1^{K(y_1)}) = 0. \tag{4.38}$$

Since $i(y_1^{mK(y_1)}) \leq (-2+\frac{\theta}{\pi})mK(y_1) - 4 < -4$, $\forall m \in \mathbf{N}$, then by Proposition 5.2 and (4.38) we know that $y_1^{mK(y_1)}$ has no contribution to m_{-1} and m_{-3}. On the other hand, note that $i(y_1^m)$ is even, it follows from Proposition 5.2 that y_1^m has no contribution to m_{-1} and m_{-3} for $m \neq 0 \pmod{K(y_1)}$. In addition, y_2^m also has no contribution to m_{-1} and m_{-3} since y_2 is hyperbolic and $i(y_2) \in 2\mathbf{Z}$. Hence we obtain $m_{-1} = m_{-3} = 0$, which, together with (5.28), yields $m_{-2} = 0$. But by (4.36) and Proposition 5.2, y_2 contributes 1 to m_{-2}. So we get a contradiction.

Step 2.2. $i(y_1) \geq -2$.

In this step, note that $i(y_1)$ and $i(y_2)$ are even, we have either $i(y_j) \geq 0$ for $1 \leq j \leq 2$, or $i(y_j) = -2$ for some $1 \leq j \leq 2$, if the former holds, then by Lemma 4.1, y_1 and y_2 are elliptic which

contradicts to our assumption. Thus we can assume that $i(y_j) = -2$ for some $1 \le j \le 2$. Then by Proposition 5.2 we have

$$m_{-2} \ge 1. \tag{4.39}$$

Note that $i(y_j) \ge -2$ for $1 \le j \le 2$ by (iv) of Claim 1. By (i) of Claim 1 and (4.31) we have

$$i(y_j^m) \ge -2, \quad \forall\, m \ge 1, \quad j = 1, 2. \tag{4.40}$$

Thus we have

$$C_{S^1,\, d(K)-q}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_j^m) = 0, \qquad \forall\, m \in \mathbf{N},\ q \ge 3,\ j = 1, 2.$$

Hence we have

$$m_{-q} = 0, \qquad \forall\, q \ge 3,$$

which, together with (4.39) and (5.28), yields

$$m_{-1} = u_{-1} + u_{-2} \ge u_{-2} = u_{-2} + u_{-3} = m_{-2} \ge 1. \tag{4.41}$$

Note that y_2^m has no contribution to m_{2k-1} for $k \in \mathbf{Z}$ since y_2 is hyperbolic and $i(y_2) \in 2\mathbf{Z}$, so some y_1^m must have contribution to m_{-1}. Also note that, in this case, $C_{S^1,\, d(K)+2i-1}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x_1^m) = 0$ for any $i \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $m \ne 0 \pmod{K(y_1)}$. Therefore m_{-1} only can be contributed by iterates $y_1^{K(y_1)}$. This implies $i(y_1^m) \le i(y_1^{K(y_1)}) = -2$, $\forall\ 1 \le m \le K(y_1) - 1$. Thus by (4.40) and Proposition 5.2, we have

$$i(y_1^m) = -2, \quad \forall\ 1 \le m \le K(y_1) - 1, \quad m_{-1} = k_1(y_1^{K(y_1)}). \tag{4.42}$$

By (4.41)-(4.42), we have $k_1(y_1^{K(y_1)}) = m_{-1} \ge m_{-2} \ge K(y_1) - 1$, which together with (4.37) yields

$$\hat{\chi}(y_1) \le 0. \tag{4.43}$$

Noticing that $i(y_j) \ge -2$ for $1 \le j \le 2$, then by (ii) of Claim 1 and (4.32) we have $\hat{i}(y_j) > 0$, which, together with (4.43) and Theorem 5.6, yields

$$\frac{\hat{\chi}(y_2)}{\hat{i}(y_2)} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\hat{\chi}(y_1)}{\hat{i}(y_1)} \ge \frac{1}{2}. \tag{4.44}$$

On the other hand, by (i) and (iv) of Claim 1, we have

$$\frac{\hat{\chi}(y_2)}{\hat{i}(y_2)} = \frac{1}{2(i(y_2) + 3)} \le \frac{1}{2},$$

which together with (4.44) implies

$$\hat{\chi}(y_1) = 0, \qquad i(y_2) = -2. \tag{4.45}$$

Then y_2^m contributes exactly 1 to m_{-2}, which, together with (4.42), yields $m_{-2} = K(y_1)$. Thus by (4.37), (4.41)-(4.42), we obtain $\hat{\chi}(y_1) < 0$, which contradicts to (4.45).

Case 3. *$\gamma_1(\tau_1)$ can be connected to $N_1(1,1)\diamond N_1(1,b)$ within $\Omega^0(\gamma_1(\tau_1))$ with $b=0$ or 1.*

In this case, we have $K(y_1)=1$ by Proposition 5.4, $i(y_1,1)$ and then $i(y_1)$ is even by Theorem 8.1.4 of [Lon2] and Lemma 2.4. By Theorem 8.3.1 of [Lon2], we obtain $i(y_1,m)=m(i(y_1,1)+2)-2$ for all $m\in\mathbf{N}$. Thus by Lemma 2.4 we have

$$i(y_1^m)=m(i(y_1)+4)-4,\quad \forall\, m\in\mathbf{N},\qquad \hat{i}(y_1)=i(y_1)+4. \tag{4.46}$$

Then we can assume that $\hat{i}(y_1)\neq 0$, and $\{y_1^m\}_{m\in\mathbf{N}}$ has contributions to the Morse-type numbers $\{m_q\}_{q\in\mathbf{Z}}$, which implies that exactly one of $k_l(y_1^m)$ for $0\leq l\leq 2$ is nonzero by (iv) of Remark 5.5.

In fact, if y_1^m has no contribution to any Morse-type number m_q, by the proof of Theorem 1.1 of [LLo1] we obtain three closed characteristics, which contradicts to our assumption. If $\hat{i}(y_1)=0$ and $\{y_1^m\}_{m\in\mathbf{N}}$ has contributions to the Morse type numbers $\{m_q\}_{q\in\mathbf{Z}}$, then $i(y_1^m)=-4$ by (4.46) and exactly one of $k_l(y_1^m)$ for $0\leq l\leq 2$ is nonzero by (iv) of Remark 5.5, then as the proof of (i) of Claim 1, we can get a contradiction.

Next we consider two subcases according to the parity of $i(y_2)$.

Subcase 3.1. *$i(y_2)$ is odd.*

For this case, as the same proof of Case 3 of Theorem 1.4 in [LLo2], we can get a contradiction.

Subcase 3.2. *$i(y_2)$ is even.*

In this case, we note that $\hat{i}(y_1)\neq 0$. If $\hat{i}(y_1)<0$, by Theorem 5.6, we have

$$\frac{\hat{\chi}(y_1)}{\hat{i}(y_1)}=0.$$

Then $\hat{\chi}(y_1)=0$. But exactly one of $k_l(y_1^m)$ for $0\leq l\leq 2$ is nonzero, which together with (5.21) implies

$$\hat{\chi}(y_1)=k_0(y_1)-k_1(y_1)+k_2(y_1)\neq 0,$$

which is a contradiction. Thus

$$\hat{i}(y_1)>0. \tag{4.47}$$

Then by Theorem 5.6 and (i) and (iv) of Claim 1, we have

$$\frac{\hat{\chi}(y_1)}{\hat{i}(y_1)}=\frac{1}{2}-\frac{\hat{\chi}(y_2)}{\hat{i}(y_2)}\geq 0.$$

Then there holds $\hat{\chi}(y_1)\geq 0$ by (4.47). By (5.21), we get

$$k_0(y_1)-k_1(y_1)+k_2(y_1)=\hat{\chi}(y_1)\geq 0,$$

which, together with (iv) of Remark 5.5, yields $k_1(y_1)=0$. Then by Proposition 5.4 we know that y_1^m has no contribution to m_{2q-1} for all $q\in\mathbf{Z}$. Note that $i(y_2)$ is even and y_2 is hyperbolic, then

by Proposition 5.2, y_2^m also has no contribution to m_{2q-1} for all $q \in \mathbf{Z}$. Thus $m_{2q-1} = 0$ for every $q \in \mathbf{Z}$, which implies $U(t) \equiv 0$ in (5.28), then

$$\sum_{i\in\mathbf{Z}} m_i t^i = \frac{1}{1-t^2} = \sum_{i\in\mathbf{N}} t^{2i-2}. \tag{4.48}$$

Thus $i(y_2) \geq 0$ by Proposition 5.2 and (4.48). Note that $i(y_1) \geq 0$ or $i(y_1) = -2$ by (4.46)-(4.47) and the fact that $i(y_1)$ is even. If $i(y_1) \geq 0$, then by Lemma 4.1 we know that the two closed characteristics are elliptic, which contradicts to our assumption. Thus we suppose $i(y_1) = -2$. By (i) of Claim 1, it is impossible that y_2^m contributes 1 to every Morse-type number m_q for $q \in 2\mathbf{N}_0$. Noticing that exactly one of $k_l(y_1^m)$ for $0 \leq l \leq 2$ is nonzero, by (4.48) we have $k_2(y_1^m) = 1$, which implies that $\{y_1^m\}_{m\in\mathbf{N}}$ contributes exactly 1 to every Morse-type number m_q for $q \in 2\mathbf{N}_0$, but y_2 also has contribution to some Morse-type number m_q, which contradicts to (4.48).

Case 4. *$\gamma_1(\tau_1)$ can be connected to $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \diamond \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ within $\Omega^0(\gamma_1(\tau_1))$.*

In this case, we have $K(y_1) = 1$ by Proposition 5.4, $i(y_1, 1)$ and then $i(y_1)$ is odd by Theorem 8.1.4 of [Lon2] and Lemma 2.4. By Theorem 8.3.1 of [Lon1], we have $i(y, m) = m(i(y, 1) + 1) - 1$ for all $m \in \mathbf{N}$. Thus by Lemma 2.4, we obtain

$$i(y_1^m) = m(i(y_1) + 3) - 3, \quad \forall\, m \in \mathbf{N}, \qquad \hat{i}(y_1) = i(y_1) + 3. \tag{4.49}$$

Then as Case 3, we can suppose that $\hat{i}(y_1) \neq 0$ and exactly one of $k_l(y_1^m)$ for $0 \leq l \leq 2$ is nonzero.

We have two subcases according to the parity of $i(y_2)$.

Subcase 4.1. *$i(y_2)$ is odd.*

For this case, as the same proof of Case 4 of Theorem 1.4 in [LLo2] we can get a contradiction.

Subcase 4.2. *$i(y_2)$ is even.*

As Subcase 3.2 we have

$$\hat{i}(y_1) > 0, \qquad \hat{\chi}(y_1) \geq 0. \tag{4.50}$$

Then by (5.21), we have

$$-k_0(y_1) + k_1(y_1) = \hat{\chi}(y_1) \geq 0,$$

which, together with (iv) of Remark 5.5, implies $k_0(y_1) = 0$. Then by Proposition 5.4 we know that y_1^m has no contribution to m_{2q-1} for all $q \in \mathbf{Z}$. Note that $i(y_2)$ is even and y_2 is hyperbolic, then by Proposition 5.2, y_2^m also has no contribution to m_{2q-1} for all $q \in \mathbf{Z}$. Thus $m_{2q-1} = 0$ for every $q \in \mathbf{Z}$, which implies $U(t) \equiv 0$ in (5.28), then we have

$$\sum_{i\in\mathbf{Z}} m_i t^i = \frac{1}{1-t^2} = \sum_{i\in\mathbf{N}} t^{2i-2}. \tag{4.51}$$

Thus $i(y_2) \geq 0$ by Proposition 5.2 and (4.51). Note that $i(y_1) \geq 1$ or $i(y_1) = -1$ by (4.49)-(4.50) and the fact that $i(y_1)$ is odd. If $i(y_1) \geq 1$, then by Lemma 4.1 we know that the two closed characteristics are elliptic, which contradicts to our assumption. Thus we suppose $i(y_1) = -1$. By (i) of Claim 1, it is impossible that y_2^m contributes 1 to every Morse-type number m_q for $q \in 2\mathbf{N}_0$. Noticing that exactly one of $k_l(y_1^m)$ for $0 \leq l \leq 1$ is nonzero, by (4.51) we have $k_1(y_1^m) = 1$ and $\{y_1^m\}_{m\in\mathbf{N}}$ contributes exactly 1 to every Morse-type number m_q for $q \in 2\mathbf{N}_0$, but y_2 also has contribution to some Morse-type numbers m_q, which contradicts to (4.51).

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is complete. ∎

In the following, we explain why Theorems 1.4 and 1.5 hold.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. By Lemma 2.4 and Corollary 3.6, we have a similar result as Theorem 1.6 of [LoZ], and by Theorem 3.10, Lemma 3.1 of [LoZ] holds for star-shaped hypersurfaces. Note that all the proofs of [LoZ] are based on the fact that every closed characteristic (τ, y) on the hypersurface Σ in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$ satisfies $i(y) \geq n$ and Theorem 1.6, Lemma 3.1 of [LoZ]. Hence for dynamically convex star-shaped case, all the theories of [LoZ] hold. Then combining it with Theorem 1.1 of [Wan2] and Theorem 1.1 of [HuO], we get the desired results. ∎

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Note that all the proofs of [WHL] and [Wan1] rely on the resonance identity in Theorem 1.2 of [WHL], the periodic property of critical modules in Proposition 3.13 of [WHL], and the results in [LoZ]. Since we have extended the theories of [WHL] to star-shaped case in [LLW], and all the theories of [LoZ] hold for dynamically convex star-shaped hypersurfaces by Theorem 1.4, then the main results of [WHL] and [Wan3] hold for dynamically convex star-shaped case, i.e., Theorem 1.5 holds. ∎

5 Appendix

In the section, we briefly review the equivariant Morse theory and the resonance identities for closed characteristics on compact star-shaped hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$ developed in [LLW]. Now we fix a $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{st}(2n)$ and assume the following condition:

(F) **There exist only finitely many geometrically distinct prime closed characteristics $\{(\tau_j, y_j)\}_{1\leq j\leq k}$ on Σ.**

Let $\hat{\sigma} = \inf_{1\leq j\leq k} \sigma_j$ and T be a fixed positive constant. Then by Section 2 of [LLW], for any $a > \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{T}$, we can construct a function $\varphi_a \in C^\infty(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}^+)$ which has 0 as its unique critical point in $[0, +\infty)$. Moreover, $\frac{\varphi'(t)}{t}$ is strictly decreasing for $t > 0$ together with $\varphi(0) = 0 = \varphi'(0)$ and $\varphi''(0) = 1 = \lim_{t\to 0^+} \frac{\varphi'(t)}{t}$. More precisely, we define φ_a and the Hamiltonian function $\widetilde{H}_a(x) = a\varphi_a(j(x))$ via Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.4 in [LLW]. The precise dependence of φ_a on a is explained in Remark 2.3 of [LLW].

For technical reasons we want to further modify the Hamiltonian, we define the new Hamiltonian function H_a via Proposition 2.5 of [LLW] and consider the fixed period problem

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}(t) &= JH_a'(x(t)), \\ x(0) &= x(T). \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

Then $H_a \in C^3(\mathbf{R}^{2n} \setminus \{0\}, \mathbf{R}) \cap C^1(\mathbf{R}^{2n}, \mathbf{R})$. Solutions of (5.1) are $x \equiv 0$ and $x = \rho z(\sigma t/T)$ with $\frac{\varphi_a'(\rho)}{\rho} = \frac{\sigma}{aT}$, where (σ, z) is a solution of (1.1). In particular, non-zero solutions of (5.1) are in one to one correspondence with solutions of (1.1) with period $\sigma < aT$.

For any $a > \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{T}$, we can choose some large constant $K = K(a)$ such that

$$H_{a,K}(x) = H_a(x) + \frac{1}{2}K|x|^2 \tag{5.2}$$

is a strictly convex function, that is,

$$(\nabla H_{a,K}(x) - \nabla H_{a,K}(y), x - y) \geq \frac{\epsilon}{2}|x - y|^2, \tag{5.3}$$

for all $x, y \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}$, and some positive ϵ. Let $H_{a,K}^*$ be the Fenchel dual of $H_{a,K}$ defined by

$$H_{a,K}^*(y) = \sup\{x \cdot y - H_{a,K}(x) \mid x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}\}.$$

The dual action functional on $X = W^{1,2}(\mathbf{R}/T\mathbf{Z}, \mathbf{R}^{2n})$ is defined by

$$F_{a,K}(x) = \int_0^T \left[\frac{1}{2}(J\dot{x} - Kx, x) + H_{a,K}^*(-J\dot{x} + Kx)\right] dt. \tag{5.4}$$

Then $F_{a,K} \in C^{1,1}(X, \mathbf{R})$ and for $KT \notin 2\pi\mathbf{Z}$, $F_{a,K}$ satisfies the Palais-Smale condition and x is a critical point of $F_{a,K}$ if and only if it is a solution of (5.1). Moreover, $F_{a,K}(x_a) < 0$ and it is independent of K for every critical point $x_a \neq 0$ of $F_{a,K}$.

When $KT \notin 2\pi\mathbf{Z}$, the map $x \mapsto -J\dot{x} + Kx$ is a Hilbert space isomorphism between $X = W^{1,2}(\mathbf{R}/T\mathbf{Z}; \mathbf{R}^{2n})$ and $E = L^2(\mathbf{R}/(T\mathbf{Z}), \mathbf{R}^{2n})$. We denote its inverse by M_K and the functional

$$\Psi_{a,K}(u) = \int_0^T \left[-\frac{1}{2}(M_K u, u) + H_{a,K}^*(u)\right] dt, \qquad \forall\, u \in E. \tag{5.5}$$

Then $x \in X$ is a critical point of $F_{a,K}$ if and only if $u = -J\dot{x} + Kx$ is a critical point of $\Psi_{a,K}$.

Suppose u is a nonzero critical point of $\Psi_{a,K}$. Then the formal Hessian of $\Psi_{a,K}$ at u is defined by

$$Q_{a,K}(v) = \int_0^T (-M_K v \cdot v + H_{a,K}^{*\prime\prime}(u)v \cdot v)dt, \tag{5.6}$$

which defines an orthogonal splitting $E = E_- \oplus E_0 \oplus E_+$ of E into negative, zero and positive subspaces. The index and nullity of u are defined by $i_K(u) = \dim E_-$ and $\nu_K(u) = \dim E_0$ respectively. Similarly, we define the index and nullity of $x = M_K u$ for $F_{a,K}$, we denote them by $i_K(x)$ and $\nu_K(x)$. Then we have

$$i_K(u) = i_K(x), \quad \nu_K(u) = \nu_K(x), \tag{5.7}$$

which follow from the definitions (5.4) and (5.5). The following important formula was proved in Lemma 6.4 of [Vit2]:

$$i_K(x) = 2n([KT/2\pi] + 1) + i^v(x) \equiv d(K) + i^v(x), \tag{5.8}$$

where the index $i^v(x)$ does not depend on K, but only on H_a.

By the proof of Proposition 2 of [Vit1], we have that $v \in E$ belongs to the null space of $Q_{a,K}$ if and only if $z = M_K v$ is a solution of the linearized system

$$\dot{z}(t) = JH_a''(x(t))z(t). \tag{5.9}$$

Thus the nullity in (5.7) is independent of K, which we denote by $\nu^v(x) \equiv \nu_K(u) = \nu_K(x)$.

By Proposition 2.11 of [LLW], the index $i^v(x)$ and nullity $\nu^v(x)$ coincide with those defined for the Hamiltonian $H(x) = j(x)^\alpha$ for all $x \in \mathbf{R}^{2n}$ and some $\alpha \in (1,2)$. Especially $1 \le \nu^v(x) \le 2n-1$ always holds.

We have a natural S^1-action on X or E defined by

$$\theta \cdot u(t) = u(\theta + t), \quad \forall\, \theta \in S^1,\, t \in \mathbf{R}. \tag{5.10}$$

Clearly both of $F_{a,K}$ and $\Psi_{a,K}$ are S^1-invariant. For any $\kappa \in \mathbf{R}$, we denote by

$$\Lambda_{a,K}^\kappa = \{u \in L^2(\mathbf{R}/T\mathbf{Z}; \mathbf{R}^{2n}) \mid \Psi_{a,K}(u) \le \kappa\}, \tag{5.11}$$

$$X_{a,K}^\kappa = \{x \in W^{1,2}(\mathbf{R}/(T\mathbf{Z}), \mathbf{R}^{2n}) \mid F_{a,K}(x) \le \kappa\}. \tag{5.12}$$

For a critical point u of $\Psi_{a,K}$ and the corresponding $x = M_K u$ of $F_{a,K}$, let

$$\Lambda_{a,K}(u) = \Lambda_{a,K}^{\Psi_{a,K}(u)} = \{w \in L^2(\mathbf{R}/(T\mathbf{Z}), \mathbf{R}^{2n}) \mid \Psi_{a,K}(w) \le \Psi_{a,K}(u)\}, \tag{5.13}$$

$$X_{a,K}(x) = X_{a,K}^{F_{a,K}(x)} = \{y \in W^{1,2}(\mathbf{R}/(T\mathbf{Z}), \mathbf{R}^{2n}) \mid F_{a,K}(y) \le F_{a,K}(x)\}. \tag{5.14}$$

Clearly, both sets are S^1-invariant. Denote by $\mathrm{crit}(\Psi_{a,K})$ the set of critical points of $\Psi_{a,K}$. Because $\Psi_{a,K}$ is S^1-invariant, $S^1 \cdot u$ becomes a critical orbit if $u \in \mathrm{crit}(\Psi_{a,K})$. Note that by the condition (F), the number of critical orbits of $\Psi_{a,K}$ is finite. Hence as usual we can make the following definition.

Definition 5.1. *Suppose u is a nonzero critical point of $\Psi_{a,K}$, and $\mathcal{N}$ is an S^1-invariant open neighborhood of $S^1 \cdot u$ such that* $\mathrm{crit}(\Psi_{a,K}) \cap (\Lambda_{a,K}(u) \cap \mathcal{N}) = S^1 \cdot u$. *Then the S^1-critical modules of $S^1 \cdot u$ are defined by*

$$C_{S^1,\,q}(\Psi_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot u) = H_q((\Lambda_{a,K}(u) \cap \mathcal{N})_{S^1},\ ((\Lambda_{a,K}(u) \setminus S^1 \cdot u) \cap \mathcal{N})_{S^1}).$$

Similarly, we define the S^1-critical modules $C_{S^1,\,q}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot x)$ of $S^1 \cdot x$ for $F_{a,K}$.

We fix a and let $u_K \neq 0$ be a critical point of $\Psi_{a,K}$ with multiplicity $\mathrm{mul}(u_K) = m$, that is, u_K corresponds to a closed characteristic $(\tau, y) \subset \Sigma$ with (τ, y) being m-iteration of some prime closed characteristic. Precisely, we have $u_K = -J\dot{x} + Kx$ with x being a solution of (5.1) and $x = \rho y(\frac{\tau t}{T})$ with $\frac{\varphi_a'(\rho)}{\rho} = \frac{\tau}{aT}$. Moreover, (τ, y) is a closed characteristic on Σ with minimal period $\frac{\tau}{m}$. By Lemma 2.10 of [LLW], we construct a finite dimensional S^1-invariant subspace G of $L^2(\mathbf{R}/T\mathbf{Z}; \mathbf{R}^{2n})$ and a functional $\psi_{a,K}$ on G. For any $p \in \mathbf{N}$ satisfying $p\tau < aT$, we choose K such that $pK \notin \frac{2\pi}{T}\mathbf{Z}$, then the pth iteration u_{pK}^p of u_K is given by $-J\dot{x}^p + pKx^p$, where x^p is the unique solution of (5.1) corresponding to $(p\tau, y)$ and is a critical point of $F_{a,pK}$, that is, u_{pK}^p is the critical point of $\Psi_{a,pK}$ corresponding to x^p. Denote by g_{pK}^p the critical point of $\psi_{a,pK}$ corresponding to u_{pK}^p and let $\widetilde{\Lambda}_{a,K}(g_K) = \{g \in G \mid \psi_{a,K}(g) \le \psi_{a,K}(g_K)\}$.

Now we use the theory of Gromoll and Meyer, denote by $W(g^p_{pK})$ the local characteristic manifold of g^p_{pK}. Then we have

Proposition 5.2.(cf. Proposition 4.2 of [LLW]) *For any $p \in \mathbf{N}$, we choose K such that $pK \notin \frac{2\pi}{T}\mathbf{Z}$. Let $u_K \neq 0$ be a critical point of $\Psi_{a,K}$ with $\mathrm{mul}(u_K) = 1$, $u_K = -J\dot{x} + Kx$ with x being a critical point of $F_{a,K}$. Then for all $q \in \mathbf{Z}$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} &C_{S^1,\,q}(\Psi_{a,pK},\ S^1 \cdot u^p_{pK}) \\ &\quad \cong \left(H_{q-i_{pK}(u^p_{pK})}(W(g^p_{pK}) \cap \widetilde{\Lambda}_{a,pK}(g^p_{pK}), (W(g^p_{pK}) \setminus \{g^p_{pK}\}) \cap \widetilde{\Lambda}_{a,pK}(g^p_{pK})) \right)^{\beta(x^p)\mathbf{Z}_p}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

where $\beta(x^p) = (-1)^{i_{pK}(u^p_{pK}) - i_K(u_K)} = (-1)^{i^v(x^p) - i^v(x)}$. Thus

$$C_{S^1,\,q}(\Psi_{a,pK},\ S^1 \cdot u^p_{pK}) = 0 \quad if q < i_{pK}(u^p_{pK}) \text{ or } q > i_{pK}(u^p_{pK}) + \nu_{pK}(u^p_{pK}) - 1. \tag{5.16}$$

In particular, if u^p_{pK} is non-degenerate, i.e., $\nu_{pK}(u^p_{pK}) = 1$, then

$$C_{S^1,\,q}(\Psi_{a,pK},\ S^1 \cdot u^p_{pK}) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{Q}, & \text{if } q = i_{pK}(u^p_{pK}) \text{ and } \beta(x^p) = 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{5.17}$$

We make the following definition:

Definition 5.3. *For any $p \in \mathbf{N}$, we choose K such that $pK \notin \frac{2\pi}{T}\mathbf{Z}$. Let $u_K \neq 0$ be a critical point of $\Psi_{a,K}$ with $\mathrm{mul}(u_K) = 1$, $u_K = -J\dot{x} + Kx$ with x being a critical point of $F_{a,K}$. Then for all $l \in \mathbf{Z}$, let*

$$\begin{aligned} k_{l,\pm 1}(u^p_{pK}) &= \dim \left(H_l(W(g^p_{pK}) \cap \widetilde{\Lambda}_{a,pK}(g^p_{pK}), (W(g^p_{pK}) \setminus \{g^p_{pK}\}) \cap \widetilde{\Lambda}_{a,pK}(g^p_{pK})) \right)^{\pm\mathbf{Z}_p}, \\ k_l(u^p_{pK}) &= \dim \left(H_l(W(g^p_{pK}) \cap \widetilde{\Lambda}_{a,pK}(g^p_{pK}), (W(g^p_{pK}) \setminus \{g^p_{pK}\}) \cap \widetilde{\Lambda}_{a,pK}(g^p_{pK})) \right)^{\beta(x^p)\mathbf{Z}_p}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $k_l(u^p_{pK})$'s are called critical type numbers of u^p_{pK}.

By Theorem 3.3 of [LLW], we obtain that $k_l(u^p_{pK})$ is independent of the choice of K and denote it by $k_l(x^p)$, here $k_l(x^p)$'s are called critical type numbers of x^p.

We have the following properties for critical type numbers:

Proposition 5.4.(cf. Proposition 4.6 of [LLW]) *Let $x \neq 0$ be a critical point of $F_{a,K}$ with $\mathrm{mul}(x) = 1$ corresponding to a critical point u_K of $\Psi_{a,K}$. Then there exists a minimal $K(x) \in \mathbf{N}$ such that*

$$\nu^v(x^{p+K(x)}) = \nu^v(x^p), \quad i^v(x^{p+K(x)}) - i^v(x^p) \in 2\mathbf{Z}, \qquad \forall p \in \mathbf{N}, \tag{5.18}$$

$$k_l(x^{p+K(x)}) = k_l(x^p), \qquad \forall p \in \mathbf{N},\ l \in \mathbf{Z}. \tag{5.19}$$

We call $K(x)$ the minimal period of critical modules of iterations of the functional $F_{a,K}$ at x.

For every closed characteristic (τ, y) on Σ, let $aT > \tau$ and choose φ_a as above. Determine ρ uniquely by $\frac{\varphi_a'(\rho)}{\rho} = \frac{\tau}{aT}$. Let $x = \rho y(\frac{\tau t}{T})$. Then we define the index $i(\tau, y)$ and nullity $\nu(\tau, y)$ of (τ, y) by

$$i(\tau, y) = i^v(x), \qquad \nu(\tau, y) = \nu^v(x).$$

Then the mean index of (τ, y) is defined by

$$\hat{i}(\tau, y) = \lim_{m\to\infty} \frac{i(m\tau, y)}{m}. \tag{5.20}$$

Note that by Proposition 2.11 of [LLW], the index and nullity are well defined and are independent of the choice of a.

For a closed characteristic (τ, y) on Σ, we simply denote by $y^m \equiv (m\tau, y)$ the m-th iteration of y for $m \in \mathbf{N}$. By Proposition 3.2 of [LLW], we can define the critical type numbers $k_l(y^m)$ of y^m to be $k_l(x^m)$, where x^m is the critical point of $F_{a,K}$ corresponding to y^m. We also define $K(y) = K(x)$.

Remark 5.5.(cf. Remark 4.10 of [LLW]) *Note that $k_l(y^m) = 0$ for $l \notin [0, \nu(y^m) - 1]$ and it can take only values 0 or 1 when $l = 0$ or $l = \nu(y^m) - 1$. Moreover, the following facts are useful:*

(i) $k_0(y^m) = 1$ implies $k_l(y^m) = 0$ for $1 \le l \le \nu(y^m) - 1$.

(ii) $k_{\nu(y^m)-1}(y^m) = 1$ implies $k_l(y^m) = 0$ for $0 \le l \le \nu(y^m) - 2$.

(iii) $k_l(y^m) \ge 1$ for some $1 \le l \le \nu(y^m) - 2$ implies $k_0(y^m) = k_{\nu(y^m)-1}(y^m) = 0$.

(iv) In particular, only one of the $k_l(y^m)$s for $0 \le l \le \nu(y^m)-1$ can be non-zero when $\nu(y^m) \le 3$.

For a closed characteristic (τ, y) on Σ, the average Euler characteristic $\hat{\chi}(y)$ of y is defined by

$$\hat{\chi}(y) = \frac{1}{K(y)} \sum_{\substack{1\le m\le K(y)\\ 0\le l\le 2n-2}} (-1)^{i(y^m)+l} k_l(y^m). \tag{5.21}$$

$\hat{\chi}(y)$ is a rational number. In particular, if all y^ms are non-degenerate, then by Proposition 5.4 we have

$$\hat{\chi}(y) = \begin{cases} (-1)^{i(y)}, & \text{if } \ i(y^2) - i(y) \in 2\mathbf{Z}, \\ \frac{(-1)^{i(y)}}{2}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{5.22}$$

We have the following mean index identities for closed characteristics.

Theorem 5.6. *Suppose that $\Sigma \in \mathcal{H}_{st}(2n)$ satisfies $^{\#}\mathcal{T}(\Sigma) < +\infty$. Denote all the geometrically distinct prime closed characteristics by $\{(\tau_j,\ y_j)\}_{1\le j\le k}$. Then the following identities hold*

$$\sum_{\substack{1\le j\le k\\ \hat{i}(y_j)>0}} \frac{\hat{\chi}(y_j)}{\hat{i}(y_j)} = \frac{1}{2}, \tag{5.23}$$

$$\sum_{\substack{1\le j\le k\\ \hat{i}(y_j)<0}} \frac{\hat{\chi}(y_j)}{\hat{i}(y_j)} = 0. \tag{5.24}$$

Let $F_{a,K}$ be a functional defined by (5.4) for some $a, K \in \mathbf{R}$ sufficiently large and let $\epsilon > 0$ be small enough such that $[-\epsilon, 0)$ contains no critical values of $F_{a,K}$. For b large enough, The normalized Morse series of $F_{a,K}$ in $X^{-\epsilon} \setminus X^{-b}$ is defined, as usual, by

$$M_a(t) = \sum_{q\ge 0,\ 1\le j\le p} \dim C_{S^1,\,q}(F_{a,K},\ S^1 \cdot v_j) t^{q-d(K)}, \tag{5.25}$$

where we denote by $\{S^1 \cdot v_1, \ldots, S^1 \cdot v_p\}$ the critical orbits of $F_{a,K}$ with critical values less than $-\epsilon$. The Poincaré series of $H_{S^1,*}(X, X^{-\epsilon})$ is $t^{d(K)}Q_a(t)$, according to Theorem 5.1 of [LLW], if we set $Q_a(t) = \sum_{k\in\mathbf{Z}} q_k t^k$, then

$$q_k = 0 \qquad \forall\ k \in \mathring{I}, \tag{5.26}$$

where I is an interval of $\mathbf{Z}$ such that $I \cap [i(\tau,y), i(\tau,y)+\nu(\tau,y)-1] = \emptyset$ for all closed characteristics (τ, y) on Σ with $\tau \geq aT$. Then by Section 6 of [LLW], we have

$$M_a(t) - \frac{1}{1-t^2} + Q_a(t) = (1+t)U_a(t), \tag{5.27}$$

where $U_a(t) = \sum_{i\in\mathbf{Z}} u_i t^i$ is a Laurent series with nonnegative coefficients. If there is no closed characteristic with $\hat{i} = 0$, then

$$M(t) - \frac{1}{1-t^2} = (1+t)U(t), \tag{5.28}$$

where $M(t) = \sum_{i\in\mathbf{Z}} m_i t^i$ denotes the limit of $M_a(t)$ as a tends to infinity, $U(t) = \sum_{i\in\mathbf{Z}} u_i t^i$ denotes the limit of $U_a(t)$ as a tends to infinity and possesses only non-negative coefficients. Specially, suppose that there exists an integer $p < 0$ such that the coefficients of $M(t)$ satisfy $m_p > 0$ and $m_q = 0$ for all integers $q < p$. Then (5.28) implies

$$m_{p+1} \geq m_p. \tag{5.29}$$

References

[AbM] M. Abreu and L. Macarini, Multiplicity of periodic orbits for dynamically convex contact forms. arXiv:1509.08441.

[BLMR] H. Berestycki, J. M. Lasry, G. Mancini and B. Ruf, Existence of multiple periodic orbits on starshaped Hamiltonian systems, *Comm. Pure. Appl. Math.* 38 (1985), 253-289.

[Cha] K. C. Chang, Infinite Dimensional Morse Theory and Multiple Solution Problems. Birkhäuser. Boston. 1993.

[CGH] D. Cristofaro-Gardiner and M. Hutchings, From one Reeb orbit to two. arXiv:1202.4839v2. *J. Diff. Geom.* to appear.

[DLLW] H. Duan, H. Liu, Y. Long and W. Wang, Non-hyperbolic closed characteristics on non-degenerate star-shaped hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$. arXiv:1510.08648.

[Eke] I. Ekeland, Convexity Methods in Hamiltonian Mechanics. Springer-Verlag. Berlin. 1990.

[EkH] I. Ekeland and H. Hofer, Convex Hamiltonian energy surfaces and their closed trajectories, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 113 (1987), 419-467.

[EkL] I. Ekeland and L. Lassoued, Multiplicité des trajectoires fermées d'un systéme hamiltonien sur une hypersurface d'energie convexe. *Ann. IHP. Anal. non Linéaire.* 4 (1987), 1-29.

[FaR] E. Fadell and P. Rabinowitz, Generalized cohomological index theories for Lie group actions with an application to bifurcation equations for Hamiltonian systems. *Invent. Math.* 45 (1978), 139-174.

[GiG] V. Ginzburg and Y. Goren, Iterated index and the mean Euler characteristic. *Journal of Topology and Analysis.* 7 (2015), 453-481.

[GHHM] V.L. Ginzburg, D. Hein, U.L. Hryniewicz, and L. Macarini, Closed Reeb orbits on the sphere and symplectically degenerate maxima. *Acta Math Vietnam.* 38 (2013), 55-78.

[Gir] M. Girardi, Multiple orbits for Hamiltonian systems on starshaped ernergy surfaces with symmetry, *Ann. IHP. Analyse non linéaire.* 1 (1984), 285-294.

[GuK] J. Gutt and J. Kang, On the minimal number of periodic orbits on some hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$. arXiv:1508.00166v1.

[HuL] X. Hu and Y. Long, Closed characteristics on non-degenerate star-shaped hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$, *Sci. China Ser. A* 45 (2002), 1038-1052.

[HuO] X. Hu and Y. Ou, Stability of closed characteristics on compact convex hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$. arXiv: 1405.4057.

[HWZ1] H. Hofer, K. Wysocki, and E. Zehnder, The dynamics on three-dimensional strictly convex energy surfaces. *Ann. of Math.* 148 (1998), 197-289.

[HWZ2] H. Hofer, K. Wysocki, and E. Zehnder, Finite energy foliations of tight three-spheres and Hamiltonian dynamics. *Ann. of Math.* 157 (2003), 125-255.

[LiL] C. Liu and Y. Long, Hyperbolic characteristics on star-shaped hypersurfaces, *Ann. IHP. Analyse non linéaire.* 16 (1999), 725-746.

[LLo1] H. Liu and Y. Long, The existence of two closed characteristics on every compact star-shaped hypersurface in $\mathbf{R}^4$. *Acta Math. Sinica, English Series.* 32 (2016), 40-53.

[LLo2] H. Liu and Y. Long, Resonance identities and stability of symmetric closed characteristics on symmetric compact star-shaped hypersurfaces. *Calc. Var. and PDEs.* 54 (2015), 3753-3787.

[LLW] H. Liu, Y. Long and W. Wang, Resonance identities for closed charactersitics on compact star-shaped hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$. *J. Funct. Anal.* 266 (2014), 5598-5638.

[Lon1] Y. Long, Precise iteration formulae of the Maslov-type index theory and ellipticity of closed characteristics. *Advances in Math.* 154 (2000), 76-131.

[Lon2] Y. Long, Index Theory for Symplectic Paths with Applications. Progress in Math. 207, Birkhäuser. Basel. 2002.

[LoZ] Y. Long and C. Zhu, Closed characteristics on compact convex hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$, *Ann. of Math.* 155 (2002), 317-368.

[Rab] P. Rabinowitz, Periodic solutions of Hamiltonian systems, *Comm. Pure. Appl. Math.* 31 (1978), 157-184.

[Szu] A. Szulkin, Morse theory and existence of periodic solutions of convex Hamiltonian systems, *Bull. Soc. Math. France.* 116 (1988), 171-197.

[Vit1] C. Viterbo, Une théorie de Morse pour les systèmes hamiltoniens étoilés, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Ser. I Math.* 301 (1985), 487-489.

[Vit2] C. Viterbo, Equivariant Morse theory for starshaped Hamiltonian systems, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 311 (1989), 621-655.

[Wan1] W. Wang, Stability of closed characteristics on compact convex hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{R}^6$. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* 11 (2009), 575-596.

[Wan2] W. Wang, Existence of closed characteristics on compact convex hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{R}^{2n}$. arXiv:1112.5501v3, (2011).

[Wan3] W. Wang, Closed characteristics on compact convex hypersurfaces in $\mathbf{R}^8$. arXiv:1112.5501v3.

[Wei] A. Weinstein, Periodic orbits for convex Hamiltonian systems, *Ann. of Math.* 108 (1978), 507-518.

[WHL] W. Wang, X. Hu and Y. Long, Resonance identity, stability and multiplicity of closed characteristics on compact convex hypersurfaces, *Duke Math. J.* 139 (2007), 411-462.